Approved For Release 2001/08/07: CIA-RDP84-00933R000400020003-5 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

26 November 1979

D. L. Scantlebury Director, Financial and General Management Studies Division United States General Accounting Office Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Sir:

Enclosed you will find the completed questionnaire contained in your letter of 23 October 1979. I hope you find the information useful.

In analyzing the answers provided in the questionnaire, one qualification should be noted. Applications programming is done in this Agency on quite a decentralized basis. The organization which I represent within CIA is only one, although the largest, applications organization and represents only about 35-40% of the applications work done in the Agency. Subsequently, while the response to questions 5, 8, and 9 represent only my group, the other responses will, in my opinion, roughly apply throughout the Agency.

STATOTHR

Should you have any further questions, please feel free to call me directly on

STATINTL

Deputy Director for Applications
Office of Data Processing

Enclosure:
Survey Questionnaire on Applications
Software Maintenance

Approved For Release 2001/08/07: CIA-RDP84-00933R069400020003-5

DD/A/ODP:

/23Nov79

STATINTL

Distribution:

Original - Addressee 1 - OLC

1 - D/ODP 2 - DD/A Chrono 2 - ODP Registry

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

ODP 9-1401

October 23, 1979

Central Intelligence Agency Proc. Div. Washington, DC 20505

Dear Sir:

The U.S. General Accounting Office, an agency of the Congress, is currently studying Federal agencies' management of applications software maintenance. As part of our study we are interested in learning of the extent and nature of software and software maintenance at Federal data processing installations. We would also like to obtain the views of knowledgeable Federal data processing professionals on these subjects.

To obtain the needed information and views, we have developed the enclosed questionnaire, which we would like to have completed by ADP managers or senior level staff at your installation.

Questionnaire responses will be reported in summary form. Although we are requesting identifying information, we are doing so solely to enable us to obtain clarifying information, if necessary, and to supply copies of our report to those who request them. Also, we may visit selected installations to augment information on the questionnaire but our intent nonetheless is to present all information obtained in summary form.

We would very much appreciate it if you would return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope within 10 days. If you have any questions, please call Mr. John Womble telephone number: (405) 686-2223 or FTS 732-2223, or Dr. Steven Merritt: (202) 275-6187 or FTS 275-6187.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

D. L. Scantlebury

Director, Financial and General Management Studies Division

Dl. Scantlebure

Enclosures

Approved For Release 2001/08/07: CIA-RDP84-00933R000400020003-5

U. S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SURVEY OF APPLICATIONS SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE

 $\frac{1118}{(1-4)}$

INTRODUCTION

STATINTL

This questionnaire seeks information about Federal agencies' management of their applications software maintenance. The questionnaire should be completed at the installation level by ADP managers or senior staff members knowledgeable about applications software maintenance. If the address to which the questionnaire has been sent is not a data processing installation, please forward it to your organization's data processing division.

Most questions can be answered by simply checking a box or writing in a small amount of information. Where exact answers are not readily available, please provide the best available estimate. If you wish to explain or amplify any answer, please do so at the end of the questionnaire.

The information we ask about the respondent is needed for follow-up purposes. Answers will generally be reported in summary form. Individuals will not be associated with specific answers.

Please return the questionnaire as soon as possible in the envelope provided. If you have any questions, please call Mr. John Womble on (405) 686-2223 or FTS 732-2223, or Dr. Steven Merritt on (202) 275-6187 or FTS 275-6187.

NOTE: In completing this questionnaire, please ignore the numbers in parentheses to the right of a question item; they are included to facilitate keypunching.

| RESPONDENT INFORMATION | STATINTL |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Decite Director for | Applications |
| FROME NUMBER | • • |
| EUREAU, OFFICE OR COMMAND | rate of African |
| Markey July De | * |

Part I Applications Software Maintenance

DEFINITION

For purposes of this questionnaire, we have defined applications software maintenance as follows: any actions taken after implementation of the software to

- 1) remove defects in the software including
 - a) defects in which the software was programmed to do something other than what the user wanted, and
 - b) defects in which the program logic was faulty with the result that the program did something other than what the programmer intended
- 2) tune the software to make it more efficient (less machine time and/or less core)
- modify or enhance the software to make it perform more end-user functions, including
 - functions originally called for in the system design, but not implemented, and
 - b) new functions requested by the user not called for in the original system design
- 4) make other modifications resulting from miscellaneous causes such as the need to interface with other systems, system software changes, etc.

NOTE: We are aware that each agency may define software maintenance differently. Regardless of your agency's definition, please answer our questions in terms of all the functions included in our definition above. This is necessary to ensure consistency in responses.

| 1. | Does your installation have responsibilit | y for |
|----|---|---------|
| | any applications software maintenance as | defined |
| | above? | (5) |

| | | , ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | |
|---|---|---|-----|
| 1 | | 1500 | V |
| 4 | ٠ | $-1\Delta L$ | res |

| 2. | No | (If | no, | please | explain | below | and | skip |
|----|----|-----|-----|---------|---------|-------|-----|------|
| | | | | tion 6. | | | | |

| Approved For Release | 2001/08/07 | : CIA-RDP84 | -0093 <u>3R000400</u> 0 | 20003-5 |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Approved For Release | 2001/06/07 | CIA-RDP04 | -00933R000400C | 120003-5 |

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP84-00933R000

| | of v | our i | the following best describes the extent nstallation's software maintenance ilities? (Please check only one.) (6) | 4. | mair form | use show the percentage of total utenance (as measured by staff h ned at your installation that fa the following categories. Show | ours) 11s i: a per | per- n each cent |
|----|-----------|------------------|--|----|------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|
| | 1. | Manager 1879Mar | Limited - Consists solely of identi- fying defects, new user requirements, trouble shooting, and installing | | for | each category (even if it is ze cents shown should add to 100%. | ro pe | rcent). |
| | | ١ | changes for applications developed by a central agency function outside this installation | | 1. | Any actions taken after implementation of the software to: Remove defects in the software, including | | - |
| | | | Limited maintenance on centrally developed applications, plus maintenance on some locally developed systems Full maintenance responsibility for | | a) | defects in which the software was programmed to do something other than what the user | 1 | % (8-10) |
| | 3. | | all applications run at this installation | | ъì | wanted defects in which the program | 5 | % (11-13) |
| | 4. | | Other (Please describe.) | | 5, | logic was faulty with the result that the program did something other than what the programmer intended | | |
| | | | | | 2. | Tune the software to make it more efficient (less machine time and/or less core) | 5 | % (14-16) |
| 3. | ins by | tallat contra | oplications software maintenance at your tion performed by installation employees, actor employees or by a mixture of both? theck only one.) | | 3. | Modify or enhance the software to make it perform more end- user functions, including | | |
| | 1. | | Installation employees do all applications software maintenance | ı | a) | functions originally called for in the system design, but not implemented | 10 | % (17-19) |
| | 2. | | Contractor employees do all the applications software maintenance | | b) | new functions requested by the user not called for in the original system design | 60 | % (20-22) |
| | ٥. | | Applications software is maintained by a mixture of installation employees and contractor employees | | 4. | Make other modifications resulting from miscellaneous | 19 | % (23-25) |
| | 4. | | Other (Please describe.) | | | causes such as the need to interface with other systems, system software changes, etc. | | - |
| | | | The state of the s | | | | 100 | % Total |
| | | | | 5. | rea war 4. | ease estimate the percentages of sources' times that are devoted re maintenance functions listed Please show a percentage for eit is zero. | to th in qu | e soft- estion |
| | | | | | Α. | Personnel | | |
| | | | | | | Programmer/analyst 6 | 4 8 % | (26-28) |
| | | | | | ١ | · | 0 % | (29-31) |
| | | | | | 1 | Administrative personnel | <u>O</u> % | (32-34) |
| | | | | | | Management personnel | 2% | (35-37) |
| | | | | | В. | Hardware | 1 50 - | (00 15) |
| | | | | | | CPU time | <u>2) %</u> | (38-40) |

| 6. Are the applications programs in use at your installation primarily business applications, primarily scientific applications, or a mixture of both business and scientific applications? (Please check only one.) (41) 1. Primarily business applications 2. Primarily scientific applications 3. A mixture of business and scientific applications 4. Other (Please describe.) 5. Next we are interested in the programming languages used in your installation. Please state for each of the languages listed below the number of application programs in that language currently in use in your installation and the average production life in years at your installation of the application programs in the language. No. of programs whose source code language in years in the language in years. |
|--|
| in that language. No. of programs Average length of production whose source code life of programs in the |
| whose source code life of programs in the |
| |
| COBOL ///0/0/ (43-47) //8/ (48-49) |
| FORTRAN / / .5/0/0/ (50-54) / /4/ (55-56) |
| PL/I /2/0/0/0/ (57-60) / /7/ (61-62) |
| BASIC / / 14/6/ (63-66) / /// (67-68) |
| ALGOL / / / (69-72) / / (73-74) |
| ASSEMBLY* $//2/0/0/(5-8)$ $1(80)$ Dupl (1-4) $//0/(9-10)$ |
| CMS-1/CMS-2 / / / (11-14) / / (15-16) |
| PASCAL / / / (17-20) / / (21-22) |
| RPG / / /5/ (23-26) / /5/ (27-28) |
| LISP / / / (29-32) / / (33-34) |
| SIMSCRIPT / / / (35-38) / / (39-40) |
| GPSS / / / / (41-44) / / (45-46) |
| DYNAMO / / / (47-50) / / (51-52) |
| SNOBOL / / / (53-56) / / (57-58) |
| SCORE / / / / (59-62) / / (63-64) |
| EASY-TRIEVE / / / / (65-68) / // (69-70) |
| DYL-260 / / / (71-74) / / (75-76) 2(80) |
| Data Base Languages / /8/0/0/ (5-8) / /6/ (8-10) OTHER (Specify) |
| * Assembly languages include BAL, EASYCODER, AUTOCODER, GMAP, COMPASS, etc. |

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP84-00933R000400020003-5

| 9. | Please write in the age (i.e., how long it has been in production) of the oldest application program in use at your installation. Write in your estimate. |
|----|---|
| | /2 years (17-18) |
| 0. | on the one of the state of the |
| | 1. COBOL 2. Assembly language* 3. / FORTRAN 5. // Other (Please specify.) |
| | * ASSEMBLY LANGUAGES INCLUDE BAL, EASYCODER, AUTOCODER, GMAP, COMPASS, etc. |
| l. | Which, if any, of the following software tools and techniques are in use at your installation? (Please check all that apply.) |
| | Tool Technique |
| | Tool Technique 1. Automated documentation (20) 1. Code arrangement (28) |
| | 2. / Source text manipulation (21) 2. / Descriptive documentation (29) |
| | 3. Program optimization (22) 3. Performance documentation (30) |
| | 4. Aids built into compilers (23) 4. Let Embedded documentation (31) |
| | 5 Special programming languages 5 Programming practices standards (32) compilers |
| | 6. Re-use of already written code (33) |
| | 7. / Quality assurance organization/ management (34) |
| | 8 Design language (27) 8 Design (35) |
| | 9. / Programming organization/management (36) |
| :. | Does your installation have an on-going (regular basis) effort to do optimization on application programs |
| | 1. Yes 2. / No 3. / Not sure |
| | Are cost accounting procedures in effect at your installation to capture personnel, hardware, and over- head cost associated with application software maintenance as defined in this questionnaire? (Please |
| | 1. /3// Yes 2. // No 3. // Not sure |
| , | If yes, are reports showing these costs regularly produced? (Please check only one.) (39) |
| | 1. / Yes 2. / No 3. / Not applicable - no procedures |
| | Please attach a sample sheet from such a report showing cost elements reported, if one is available. |
| rt | III Opinions and Views |
| · | Based upon your experience, do you believe that application software developed by contractors requires more or less maintenance than application software developed in-house? (Please check only one.) (40) |
| | 1. Contractor-developed software requires more maintenance |
| | 2. Contractor-developed software requires about the same amount of maintenance |
| | 3. Contractor-developed software requires less maintenance |
| | 4. / No opinion |

Approved For Release 2001/08/07: CIA-RDP84-00933R000400020003-5 In your opinion, which, if any, of the following actions would result in the greatest reduction in the size of the government's applications software maintenance effort? (Please check only (41)one.) Better definition of user requirements in the system development stage Better definition of user requirements for modifications to existing software Use of software tools and techniques in system development (structured design, structured coding, etc.) Providing better tools and techniques for maintenance programmers (such as interactive terminals, text editors, and program analysis tools, etc.) More thorough testing of applications programs before the system is released to production Eliminating unnecessary changes requested by users Nothing-such a reduction is not possible Other (Please specify.) 17. Does the definition of software maintenance used in this questionnaire generally agree with your agency's definition? Not sure If not, briefly state your agency's definition.

19. If you have any additional comments on any of the questions in the questionnaire or on any other aspect of software maintenance, please provide them in the space below. If you would prefer to convey your views separately, please write:

> Mr. John Womble U. S. General Accounting Office 200 N. W. 5th, Room 348 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

Dr. Steven Merritt U. S. General Accounting Office 441 G Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20548

Attn: FGMSD, Room 6011

or call them. Their telephone numbers are listed on page 1 of the questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation.

(43)

Approved For Release 2001/08/07: CIA-RDP84-00939R000400020003-5
UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

STATINTL

ODP 9-1401 rcd 2 NOV

October 23, 1979

Central Intelligence Agency Proc. Div. Washington, DC 20505

Dear Sir:

The U.S. General Accounting Office, an agency of the Congress, is currently studying Federal agencies' management of applications software maintenance. As part of our study we are interested in learning of the extent and nature of software and software maintenance at Federal data processing installations. We would also like to obtain the views of knowledgeable Federal data processing professionals on these subjects.

To obtain the needed information and views, we have developed the enclosed questionnaire, which we would like to have completed by ADP managers or senior level staff at your installation.

Questionnaire responses will be reported in summary form. Although we are requesting identifying information, we are doing so solely to enable us to obtain clarifying information, if necessary, and to supply copies of our report to those who request them. Also, we may visit selected installations to augment information on the questionnaire but our intent nonetheless is to present all information obtained in summary form.

We would very much appreciate it if you would return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope within 10 days. If you have any questions, please call Mr. John Womble telephone number: (405) 686-2223 or FTS 732-2223, or Dr. Steven Merritt: (202) 275-6187 or FTS 275-6187.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

D. L. Scantlebury

Director, Financial and General Management Studies Division

Enclosures

. 589

| | | | _ |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----|
| TRANSMIT | TAL SLIP | DATE | |
| TO: D/OD |)P _ | Indexeled - 1/28 | |
| 2D00 | Hdqs | • | |
| REMARKS: | | | |
| tu o | 966 on | 11/28 | |
| | | | |
| | , | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | Marine de la companya de la company | |
| FROM: | DD/A/ODP | | |
| ROOM NO. 2D42 | В | | |
| FORM NO .241 | REPLACES FORM 36- WHICH MAY BE USE | | 47) |

STATINTL